NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

MERTING

Wednesday,

July 27, 1994

The meeting was held in the Grand Ballroom of the ANA Hotel, 2401 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 8:30 a.m., Ray L. Hunt, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

RAY L. HUNT, Chairperson

HAZEL R. O'LEARY, Government Co-Chairperson, Secretary
of Energy

H. LAURANCE FULLER, Vice Chairperson

ROBERT O. ANDERSON, Hondo Oil & Gas Company

COLLIS P. CHANDLER, Jr., Chairman, Nominating
Committee

PATRICIA FRY GODLEY, Assistant Secretary for Fossil

Energy
JOHN R. HALL, Chairman, Finance Committee
FRANK A. McPHERSON, Chairman, Agenda Committee
C. JOHN MILLER, Committee on Marginal Wells
MARSHALL W. NICHOLLS, Executive Director
H. LEIGHTON STEWARD, Committee on the Oil Pollution
Act

WILLIAM H. WHITE, Deputy Secretary of Energy

SAG, CORP

4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

I-N-D-E-X

	PAGE
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks Chairperson Hunt	3
Consider and Approve the Proposed Report of the NPC Committee on the Oil Pollution Act Leighton Steward	4
Consider and Approve the Proposed Report of the NPC Committee on Marginal Wells C. John Miller	13
Remarks by the Honorable Hazel R. O'Leary Secretary of Energy	22
Administrative Matters Report of the NPC Co-chairs Coordinating Committee Chairperson Hunt	ee 49
Report of the NPC Agenda Committee Frank McPherson	51
Report of the NPC Finance Committee John R. Hall	53
Report of the NPC Nominating Committee Collis P. Chandler, Jr.	55
Memorial Resolution in Honor of H.A. True, Jr.	58
Discussion of Any Other Business Properly Bro Before the National Petroleum Council	ught 61
Adjournment	63

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:34 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Ray Hunt. I'm Chairman of the National Petroleum Council and I would like to welcome each of you to today's meeting. I think you will find it to be a particularly informative and interesting one.

I am prepared to read slowly and deliberately the membership role of the Council. Unless there's an uprising from the floor, I think we'll follow our normal practice and let the check-in outside the door constitute the record of attendance. If anyone has not checked in when you came into the room, please do so sometime before you leave today.

I would like to now introduce the head table. Will you hold your applause, please, until I've completed it?

On my far right and your left is Bill White, the Deputy Secretary of Energy. Why don't you stand as I call your name. Next to him is Larry Fuller, the Vice Chairman of the National Petroleum Council. Next to Larry and immediately to my right is Secretary O'Leary. On my far left is Marshall Nichol/s, Executive Director of the Council. Next to Marshall is John Miller, representing the NPC

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008 Committee on Marginal Wells. Next to John is Pat Godley, who has just been confirmed as the new Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, and immediately on my left is Leighton Steward, the Chairman of the NPC Committee on the Oil Pollution Act.

Let's give them a round of applause.

As you see from the agenda in front of you, we have a very full day today. So, we'll jump right into the business of the group.

The first item of business would be the report of one of two reports that we will receive this morning. The first dealing with the Oil Pollution Act. I'm very pleased to turn the podium over to Leighton Steward, the Chairman of the NPC Study Committee on this subject.

Leighton?

MR. STEWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, Honored Guests, NPC members, on October the 8th of '93, Energy Secretary O'Leary asked the NPC to assess from an energy production perspective the implications of a proposal by the Department of Interior's Mineral Management Service to implement the financial responsibility requirement of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. An interim report, completed in December 1993,

concentrated on the impacts of OPA '90 on the petroleum industry.

While developing the interim report, it became clear that a significant portion of the industry would be unable to meet the financial responsibility requirements if OPA '90 was interpreted too strictly by the MMS. The interim report became an important resource in the dialogue with the MMS and the Subcommittee met with the representatives of the MMS frequently to discuss their views on the various problems. The Subcommittee also reviewed summaries of more than 1,700 sets of comments received by the MMS. The Committee is now pleased to present its final report that concentrates on solutions to the problems presented by the MMS advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.

The final report contains solutions in the following areas: jurisdiction; the \$150 million financial responsibility level; the implementation of a de minimis provision; the definition of a guarantor; the criteria for self-insurance; and the interaction of OPA's financial responsibility regulations with state requirements.

With regard to the jurisdictional question, MMS has proposed including many onshore

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

facilities within the definition of property which have to be covered by certificates of financial responsibility.

In OPA '90, the responsible party for an offshore facility is defined as the lessee, permittee, or holder of an easement. These terms apply solely to the traditional offshore. They have no meaning when they are applied to a terminal or a refinery or a pipeline. It is very clear that even though there may be pipelines, wharves, piers and other similar structures that are associated with the U.S. navigable water, if they are connected to an onshore facility, they are part of that facility and are considered to be an onshore facility. It is our recommendation that MMS should clarify that OPA 190 financial responsibility requirements only apply to facilities in the territorial seas in the traditional Outer Continental Shelf.

Another major issue is the requirement for the absolute level of \$150 million of financial responsibility and whether there should be a de minimis rule and whether MMS has the flexibility to adjust the level of financial responsibility. While it is very apparent that the absolute requirement of \$150 million is a show stopper for many operators, we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

believe that MMS has the flexibility to adjust the level of financial responsibility to be commensurate with the risk.

We believe there is a clear indication in the statute that Congress intended more than one level. This is consistent with the current rules for onshore facilities and vessels that have a very clear provision for liability based on risk. A de minimis provision follows the risk weighting intent. We believe that if the worst case discharge is 250 million barrels or less, an operator should be exempt from the financial responsibility requirement.

While we recognize that money needs to be immediately available to clean up a spill, any operator with an offshore facility has the financial wherewithal to clean up and pay for damages from a small spill. If your worst case discharge is between 250 and 1,000 barrels, one could fall into the de minimis provision if you have certain mitigating factors such as operating production that is on artificial lift or if you're located in a remote area. Also, we believe an operator who has a worst case discharge of 1,000 barrels or less of natural gas condensate should be exempt. Of course, natural gas should be exempt because it does not pose a threat to

the offshore environment.

Now, there has been one suggestion for improvement by John Lichtblau which you have in front of you that has been recently approved by the Subcommittee and its inclusion in the report is intended to strengthen the de minimis provision. We have proposed that MMS make a facility by facility calculation to set the level of financial responsibility commensurate with the risk.

The calculation should take into account the volume, the location, whether it would have an impact on commercial fishing grounds or other such mitigating factors. We have recommended that MMS set levels of financial responsibility at \$35, \$50, \$75 million up to \$150 million, whatever the apparent level should be.

Thirdly, insurance companies have refused to become a guarantor which would make them subject to direct action by various injured parties. Because of this, insurance companies are unwilling to make insurance available. Since Congress specifically delineated the defenses that could be asserted by a guarantor, but left the ability to define the defenses for other parties providing evidence of financial responsibility to the Executive Branch, we believe MMS

has the authority to distinguish between indemnitors and guarantors so that an insurance company is not necessarily a guarantor. We have recommended that MMS make this distinction so that insurance will be available for the companies that cannot self-insure.

If the operator of an offshore facility cannot get insurance and has to provide up to \$150 million of financial responsibility, the only way he can meet the requirement is to self-insure. Most of the offshore operators cannot currently self-insure at the \$150 million level. So, the Committee has developed new formulas that will make it easier to self-insure. Previously, self-insurance tests have been based on financial statements that include assets at their original cost and may not accurately reflect the true financial resources that a company has available.

ror instance, oil and gas producers have valuable assets in the ground and that's in the form of their crude reserves. These may not be properly valued on their financial statements.

Also, insurance that the industry has relied on for years should be counted as an asset. While insurance companies will not offer insurance as a guarantor, they are perfectly willing to make

insurance available to cover the cost of cleaning up
a spill. This is a resource the operator has and
should be able to count on toward meeting his

financial responsibility requirements.

Next we think it's very important that MMS coordinate their program with the states. If a state has its own financial responsibility requirements and an operator has met them, that should count toward the MMS financial responsibility requirements. Previously been involved solely with the MMS has Continental Shelf. We suggest the states which already have these facilities and their programs for response planning and other purposes be allowed to administer the financial responsibility portion of OPA on behalf of MMS.

Another major concern of the Committee is the Natural Resources Damage Assessment, or NRDA. That's a provision of OPA '90. NRDA is considered a major problem because the judgments that could be rendered under it would be unpredictable, could be extremely large and could actually stand to bankrupt a company on the basis of whimsical public sentiment. It has been proposed in the advanced notice that non-use values be measured by a process called contingent value methodology, or CVM.

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Under the CVM methodology, a poll would be taken asking the public in dollar terms how much value they put on the very existence of, the option to use and the bequest value of a natural resource whether or not the public had ever or would ever use it. This would then be scaled up to the effective population of the entire United States and then that damage value would be assessed against the spiller.

The Committee agrees that there can be non-use values, but it definitely concludes that the contingent value methodology is too unreliable to be used in quantifying the damage.

The Committee hopes this report will be helpful to the process and urges MMS to use their authority to make rules which achieve OPA's important environmental goals without imposing unreasonable economic burdens on our society and forcing these issues to be settled by lengthy and costly legislation.

I'd like to express my personal thanks to Robert Armstrong of LL&E and Len Colburn of the Department of Energy who were co-chairs of the Subcommittee who put this report together and also to all the individual members of the Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I move the report be

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

approved with the addition previously mentioned and, 1 of course, subject to minor editing changes. 2 you. 3 Thank you, Leighton. CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 4 The motion has been made that this report 5 Is there a second? Second. Is there be approved. 6 any discussion? 7 All in favor, signify by saying aye. 8 (Ayes.) 9 Opposed? CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Motion carries. 12 Leighton, I again would like to commend 13 you and your entire Committee for the outstanding job 14 you all have done on this very important report. 15 Madam Secretary, I hope the report will be 16 of benefit to you in the Department and we are very 17 pleased to have performed it for you. 18 The next item of business is to receive 19 the report on the Committee on Marginal Wells. 20 Beghini, the Chairman of the Study Committee, was 21 unable to be with us today due to a prior conflict. 22 The Committee's report will be presented by John 23 Miller, who has spent a very considerable amount of 24 his personal time and energy on this report. 25

(202) 797-2525

John?

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Ray.

This is the report of the Marginal Wells Committee to the National Petroleum Council. I'm pleased to present our Committee's report for the Council's approval.

As was stated, Vic Beghini, the Chairman of the NPC Committee on Marginal Wells, regrets that he is unable to be with us this morning, but he had a prior commitment out of the country. I didn't know that was an acceptable excuse or I might have opted for it myself.

Before reviewing the study's primary findings, conclusions and recommendations, I would like to briefly note four important underlying issues and principles relating to this effort. I would ask for your considered attention to this first bullet on this as I think it's extremely important that we understand the scope of the study.

First and most importantly, per the Secretary's request, the focus of this study was limited solely to proposals for maintaining production and access to potential reserves from marginal wells. It is not a study concerning how to jumpstart the entire oil and gas industry. Adoption of such

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008 proposals are an important initial step in restoring the economic well being of our industry and nation. However, Government should be aware that marginal well incentives alone will not provide long-term solutions in that they do not encourage new activity which is the life blood of this industry. Other important steps are encouraging new exploration, deep water development, access to resources, cost relief from unnecessary regulatory compliance and enhanced recovery from all properties.

Second, this study has been conducted in an extremely short time frame. Our Committee held its organizational meeting in early April. The scope of the studies analyses was influenced by the shared goal of an early completion date. For instance, the short time frame prevented rigorous analysis of marginal gas wells, the offshore or Alaska. Therefore the study's detailed cost benefit analyses focus on existing onshore lower 48 marginal oil wells.

On behalf of the Committee, I apologize for the short review times the tight study schedule has necessitated. In fact, the study subcommittee met yesterday and based on comments received on the July 21st mailing to the Council produced a revised executive summary which is on the table in front of

you.

In addition, the Subcommittee reviewed the economic analyses that were contained in the July 21 mailing and final economic model runs documenting the analyses are being completed.

The third issue is the definition of marginal wells used in the report. A well could be classified as marginal whenever estimated future revenues from the well are equal to or less than future anticipated operating cost, environmental cost, litigation cost, federal and state tax liabilities, lease maintenance, recovery of capital expenditures and plugging and abandonment liability. Using this concept, a number of wells not normally considered marginal would be characterized as such. This subjective definition is difficult to utilize in practice, particularly for federal and state income tax purposes, but does provide a sound basis for understanding the true nature of a marginal well.

Therefore, the definition of marginal property in this report is the same as the definition in the current Internal Revenue code modified to include high water cut properties and to include injector wells for purposes of computing average daily production.

The following properties are marginal properties under the expanded definition: properties that have an average daily production of 15 barrels equivalence or less per well; properties that have an average daily production of 25 barrel equivalents or less per well with produced water accounting for 95 percent or more of total production; properties that produce heavy oil with an API gravity less than 20 While wells with amounts of larger degrees. production may be categorized as marginal because of economic and physical particular characteristics, it is not practical to provide a legislative and administrative definition broad enough to cover every possible marginal property situation.

The last underlying principle is that marginal wells exist throughout the domestic oil and gas industry in all companies. Accordingly, the Committee recommends only incentives that would be available to all owners of marginal properties without regard to the size of the owner and/or the geographic location of the property.

With these principles in mind, I now would like to review the report's executive summary in detail due to its importance and that it contains the Subcommittee's proposed revisions.

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Why are marginal wells important? Marginal wells are important contributors to the nation's energy supply and economic well being. These wells help provide access to a resource base of 350 billion barrels of oil which is a target for recovery under an improved economic environment and enhanced oil recovery technology. Many domestic oil and gas businesses, both large and small, rely on these marginal wells as the backbone of their operations.

These operations comprised of many producing leases should be viewed as a small business struggling to survive in a global marketplace. However, as global market factors caused commodity prices to fluctuate, the economic viability of these wells is precarious. As a result, the backbone of these many businesses can collapse as decreasing oil prices destroy the contribution of marginal oil wells.

There is a growing recognition of the importance of marginal wells. Some producing states have enacted measures to preserve marginal well contributions to their economies. In December of 1993, the Secretary of Energy requested that the National Petroleum Council conduct this study on marginal wells. In February of 1994, a broad industry and bipartisan congressional coalition developed

proposals aimed at preserving marginal wells. President Clinton, in a letter to Senator Boren or July 5th, 1994 recognized the need to identify policies that can extend the margin of economic production which could include provisions to extend the economic life of stripper wells onshore.

What is at risk? Marginal wells are by definition endangered. As domestic oil production declines, oil and gas industry jobs are lost and the trade deficit increases as more crude oil is imported. There are hundreds of thousands of marginal wells, each of which is a tiny economic engine providing jobs, energy security and state and federal tax and royalty revenues. It is important to recognize that marginal wells almost always run out of money before they run out of oil and gas.

The danger in losing these wells is embodied in their collective loss. This would cause the country to lose the opportunity to take advantage of new technology and improved prices which are crucial in recovering a portion of the 350 billion barrels of resource.

what must be done to preserve marginal well contribution? Preserving marginal wells is central to our energy security. Neither government

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

nor the industry can set the global market price of crude oil. Therefore, the nation's internal cost structure must be relied upon for preserving marginal well contributions. This report recommends four federal income tax incentives as well as regulatory and administrative actions to help preserve the contribution of marginal wells to the domestic economy.

In order for these incentives to be fully effective, all of the recommended tax credits and deductions must be applicable to both regular and alternative minimum tax liability. Additionally, the marginal well credits should be transferrable.

As outlined on the slide, the Committee recommends the following incentives: a marginal well credit to allow a tax credit for a specified amount of daily production from marginal wells. This credit is intended to be a safety net. It would be phased in as the average domestic well head crude oil price falls below a specified level. An improved, enhanced oil recovery credit to expand the current 15 percent tax credit for certain projects on marginal properties; an inactive well incentive to provide a 15 percent tax credit for qualifying expenditures incurred in reactivating wells that had been inactive for two or

more years. Immediate expensing of all capital expenditures to encourage investment in needed equipment on marginal properties. Regulatory royalty and cost relief to help preserve the contribution of marginal wells by reducing the impact of increasing cost.

recommendations is an investment in the domestic oil and gas industry, yielding specific economic and social benefits. The various recommendations, when taken in aggregate, provide these benefits in a cost effective manner. Since the economic benefit of these proposals will accrue to the nation, the cost should be borne by society at large.

In closing, the Committee wishes to thank the participants in this study for their commitment and almost non-stop efforts in getting this project done. I also wish to express our appreciation to the Department of Energy, particularly EIA, Fossil Energy and the Policy Office, for their considerable support of the study.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my presentation. I believe that this report is responsive to the Secretary's request and should be of significant value to the Administration and Congress

in agreeing on the appropriate steps that need to be 1 move that the National I Accordingly, 2 taken. Petroleum Council adopt the proposed report subject to 3 final editing. 4 Thank you, John. CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 5 The motion has been made that the NPC 6 approve the report subject to final editing. Is there 7 Second. Any discussion? a second? 8 All in favor, signify by saying aye. 9 (Ayes.) 10 CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Opposed? 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Motion carries. 13 I'd like to repeat one thing that John 14 said that is very, very important. This study relates 15 solely to marginal wells. It does not relate to the 16 entire industry and the recommendations that are 17 important to marginal wells, would not serve as a 18 panacea to the problems and the issues relating to the 19 20 industry at large. Secondly, over the last several years, we 21 have put particular emphasis on the ability of the NPC 22 to respond in a very rapid and timely manner whenever 23 an issue arose that the Secretary and the Department 24

of Energy wished the NPC to become involved with.

think this study demonstrates beautifully how quickly the NPC can respond.

Madam Secretary, I hope that this study is

of benefit to you and again would like to commend all of you who worked so diligently on this report.

At this point, the next item on the agenda is remarks and comments from Secretary O'Leary.

Madam Secretary?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Thank you, Ray.

First of all, I'd like to say a hearty good morning to each of you and begin by recognizing the hard work done by the two committees to do a fast turn-around on the studies that we all deemed so necessary. And I want to use that as an opportunity also to recognize Ray, who has had an excellent experience, I hope he would say to the group --

CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Definitely.

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: -- in providing leadership and dealing with the Secretary of Energy that he wished he had more often available to him. I want to apologize for that, but I also want to point out to you that we have at our disposal in the Department of Energy an excellent group of professionals and political appointees who have served you well and I want to use this as an occasion to

recognize Bill White and certainly Reggie Spiller, Marvin and the crew, and celebrate with you the final two political appointees just confirmed last Friday night, Patricia Godley, who certainly will serve us well and has from a closet while attempting valiantly not to manage anything while affecting much, so I hope that you will delight with me in celebrating this wonderful staff.

I want to come down for a moment and then
I'm going to come back up to the podium because I have
some prepared remarks if I do not utter my staff will
be very annoyed.

You want to wire me up there? Bear with me. I thought I was on. Yes, thank you.

I want to provide some insight to those of you who don't often deal with the Department of Energy to focus on our relatively broad mandate. I apologize for using this very small visual aid, but it did not occur to me until last night that this might be an excellent starting off point. If I had thought about it yesterday afternoon, we'd have had an overhead or something.

This product, these five-ringed circles, are our attempt in the Department of Energy over almost a year to try to get come consensus within the

Department as to what the heck we do. What are our missions in a very dramatically changed world?

Many people don't focus on the fact that the Department of Energy, created under Jimmy Carter with some fine leaders that we all know, could have been called many other things. It could have been called the Department of Science and Technology for at its very core and center are really the national laboratories, the three weapons productions facilities and the others which represent, now hear me, an \$8 billion budget item to the Department in this fiscal year, and that includes all of the work done in nonproliferation and weapons dismantlement as well as the work done with industries that we are interested in here, oil and gas, specifically in areas of creating more efficient production capabilities. point that out to you because it's a huge resource and it also touches upon the study that we're asking that you undertake next.

I want now to move very quickly to our national security area. As has often been explained by a great friend of mine, Lewellyn King, who does the Energy Daily, when I came into this job this Secretary was the armaments queen of the nation. Now, if you're in the oil and gas business, you don't think about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that a lot, but, in point of fact, our major customer for that part of our business line has always been the Department of Defense and the National Security Council to a great degree. And I point that out to you because we are now struggling with the issue of what should be the mission of these laboratories who now do their work, their principle work, on the nonproliferation side while at the same time maintaining the capability to build and first of all design new nuclear weapons and to keep them safe and secure.

why should you care? You should care because much of the technology involved in now developing a proxy for the bomb as opposed to testing a bomb itself as we reach toward an extension of the nonproliferation treaty involves science and technology which again can be a very helpful piece to the constituency in this room.

finally, in case you thought I had forgotten about it, I want to touch upon what we're now calling our energy resources pod. This is the traditional area in which I have worked in the three times I've been in the Department of Energy and its predecessor agencies which the public seems to know very little about unless there's a crisis, and I test

this often when I talk to groups of people who have no involvement in any of the work we do. I ask them what do they think the Department of Energy is all about and they think maybe it has something to do with the electric utilities, maybe it has something to do with nuclear power, but they never quite get it unless there's a crisis. I point this out to you for two reasons.

The time spent working in this pod, if it were reflected by a budget impact, which is the way Washington often measures importance of agencies, would be very small, but its impact in terms of the broad mission and what it touches in the gross national product is large. But the interest level there, as we all know in the room, is relatively low. What have we done in the past 19 months to try and change that?

Well, first of all, we're starting to focus on things that don't necessarily talk about energy resource. Let's try sustainable development. Does that drive you nuts? Does that drive you nuts? Does that make you nervous? Talk to me. Must, you're so quiet. It does? Let me talk about this for a minute.

What we've been trying for the last six

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

months is to talk about sustainable development and to I talk about describe it in very pragmatic terms. economic growth. The top of that line there, if you could see it, has to do with global competition, our industrial competition. And I talk about also environmental quality. And then we talk about equity, sort of ensuring that everybody gets a piece of the pie. Not a bad idea. It steps away from the clash of those who think that environmental protection is on this side and economic development or jobs ought to be on the other side and there's no room for joining. It's an interesting way to talk about the work that gets done in that pod. Just try it on for the rest of the day and tell me if it rests easy on you.

The other pod is environmental quality, and in the old days that used to be called the environmental restoration area. It's the work that Tom Grumley does. You need to know about that for two reasons. It is the largest piece of our budget, last year out-stripping the defense or national security budget, and very much attracts the attention of people living in the 50 sites that represented the weapons production work of the Department of Energy. That's what engages the Department. That's what engages me pretty much.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The way we've tried to focus what we do is to say that none of this matters unless the final for which there is no organizational component save a very little one, really drives jobs in the Unites States of America. And we have to start to think about in the Department what do we do to 6 create high quality, high value jobs while taking care of all of the other missions. You ought to like this 8 way we're thinking because what it does is it brings 9 us back to the loop, puts us here and makes it clear 10 to us, as it has been clear to you from the very 11 beginning, that if there's nothing to power the 12 economy it does not happen. 13

> That's sort of the overview of the way we're thinking. And that, Ray, is why you don't see me as often as you'd like.

> I want to step into another area and I recognize that this is dangerous for me, because I've tried it before. I'm going to try it in another way today.

> About six months ago, I was slated to speak to an annual meeting of the semi-conductor industry. And as often is the case, our staff asked the question, "What would you like the Secretary to say?" Well, the standard, better than sliced bread,

1

2

3

5

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

very important to the U.S. economy, can't do without us, and some wag put a line in a couple, about a page of bullet points of themes that I might consider discussing. I ought to say that the semi-conductor industry is the oil and gas industry of the 21st century. Well, I didn't say it, but understand the challenge was there. That's the way that industry is thinking about itself.

I'll come up here and get on my notes so
I don't make my folks too nervous anymore.

The point I'm making to you is that, as we go forward at a time when these four circles could be in competition as we try to put them together and make the four circles support each other, there are other industries who would contend that you in this room, who've really forged the foundation for economic development and opportunity in the United States, don't have a place in the 21st century. Now, if I were in my office, I would use those horrible words that I'm not allowed to use in public because I wouldn't like to be accused of bad language, but you understand my point. That's BS is what it is.

But what we need to do as a group, if we can, is recognize that the 21st century has some challenges, the obvious challenges that have been

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

spoken to with respect to the fast study on marginal wells and the need to address the whole industry.

I want to make a couple other points to get you thinking, and I know you often do, but I want you to think sort of in the way that we think, if you can stand it for a day. I think that we have made —
I believe that we have made significant progress this year in raising the issues on this side of the fiveringed circle. Let me tell you why.

I read with a great deal of interest and heard for two months before it happened about the formation in the Congress of an oil and gas caucus. Sounds to me like a great idea, an idea whose time has come and I believe grew out of the letter written to the President, cc'ed to everybody in the Administration who had anything to do with natural resources or sustainable development, saying "do something for this industry."

Last month with the President and about 70 members of the Congress, focusing on the initiatives and the recommendations that have come out of this group as a body, and in some instances an individual, in my mind was a significant breakthrough, maybe not in your mind, but let me tell you where we are. This is the first President I know of in 12 years who's met

with people who represent the industry. Am I right or wrong about that? Truth or not? Talk to me. Yes? Did anybody else do that? Does anybody here know? Did anybody else? Was there a meeting in the Bush Administration? No? Okay, you get my point.

Now, so we're saying -- so the honor of the thing was a meeting. What happened after that? Is that what you want me to talk about? Let me try this.

First of all, even before the meeting the part commitment on there was Administration, thanks to some heavy lifting by Bill White and a little by others of us, to sign on for Bennett Johnson's bill, S-318 for royalty relief. Not Significant piece to get an much, you think? administration, any administration in the last three years, to sign on to a piece of legislation that would provide some equity in terms of relief to this industry.

Let me now talk about Alaska North Shore. Everybody may not think that that's a good idea. We have, I think, today moving through our Administration to the President a recommendation with respect to our Administration's position on that piece. Understand the significant progress that has taken place in terms

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of -- I want to think it was 13 months ago we first started to talk about some initiatives to provide some price relief to the industry. I believe that that's progress. But I'm also clear on the fact that we have been fire fighting. Do you know what I'm trying to express? Sort of taking our initiatives one at a time and doing the best we can.

I know before the Coordinating Council last night there was some discussion about what next steps ought to be. Now I'm going to step in dangerous territory again because when I was in Houston I made another speech and I talked about a strategy for this industry. I think the word "strategy" makes everyone uncomfortable, but what I'd like us to think about as a group, if at all possible, is if we could further the understanding which clearly was the now President's, and that is that this industry is a Could we think about how to strategic industry. further that understanding in the American public in terms of the next steps or what some of us have been referring to as the big study which begins now to once again paint the picture and really takes advantage of the work that's been done over the years and simply applies the knowledge to the American public and talks about benefits coming from this industry to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

American economy. That's the piece that I would like to see done.

In addition, there's been some planning done to get us back into the center of the Department of Energy's mission to really focus on what R&D is needed for the industry to further its opportunities to produce power and to drive the U.S. economy.

Most importantly, as I am now understanding, we need to consider also how we communicate to each other about what's available within that Department of Energy's empire that might be useful to people who are practicing, who are producing, who are exploring for working further upstream. That's what I'd like us to focus on.

You have been very quiet. That always bothers me. What I'd like to do, with Ray's permission, is I'd like to shut up and I'd like to take some real straight, from the heart or hip, questions and answers.

But before doing that, I want to recognize the new members who are here today and I'd like you to raise your hands.

Okay. You are now a part of an august group, pulled together by a President of the United States some many years ago, and you've followed the

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

work of this industry for many agencies and many iterations. This is a group that paves its own way. Now that makes us all feel good. But more important, this is a group that makes a contribution.

newly joined because you've done it as an act of faith. Those of you who have agreed to serve again, I want to thank you even more because this is truly an act of faith. And I also want to thank you for opening up participation in this group because I think it will make us all the more powerful. This is especially true if we can embrace the concept of sustainable development.

At a time when attack on this industry comes from a perception that we are -- and I have to think of myself as belonging in this group. I have for most of my life -- energy inefficient and polluting. We can change this perception as we move forward and work on some of these issues that we are committed to work on together.

Finally, before you start to talk to me,

I want to say to you that my commitment to this
industry is long-standing. Last night, I was reminded
by so many people in the room of the privilege I've
had to work with so many of you over the years and

perhaps more importantly, the privilege to be shaped by so many of you who are not with us anymore. So, this is serious business for me and you may and must know that I am your advocate. I take on that responsibility with a great sense of privilege and challenge.

So, I'd like now to listen. Thank you.

Anybody want to talk?

Yes, sir?

SPEAKER: Madame Secretary, you mentioned the theme for energy development. Do you find --concepts developing that subject and particularly contrast sustainable energy development to the way we do things now. What's different about it from your perception?

about it in my perception, and the way we have tried to attack it in the Department of Energy is to stop the fight. The fight which is always presumed that you can have one but not the other. That you can have growth and good jobs and development, but if you do that, then you must leave the environmental protection piece behind.

The way we have expressed that in the Department of Energy, to those of you who have noted,

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

is in the work we've done on the Global Climate Change
Initiative. For quite frankly, we decided early-on
looking at the economics of the piece, that there was
no point in trying to get a commanding control

6 to the 1990 level within six years.

We decided the best way to do that was through a voluntary effort which said, "let us respect the industry and its clear sense that sometimes abating pollution is a more cost-effective thing than to let it continue." And let the industries and their various groups plan how they want to meet that challenge. That was a significant step away from the perception of many who thought we must punish people because somehow, they've done something wrong or evil. More importantly, I think it recognized that the economic drivers could be there if we let business people make their own decisions while we set the standards.

authority, to try and abate greenhouse gas emissions

I think it's proven out to be a very good investment and it made good common sense. In about three months, we got more than 900 firms, individual firms, to sign commitments to voluntarily reduce their greenhouse emissions. And we did not ask them to meet the President's goal, but we asked them to do the best

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

that they could because we recognized that everybody 1 wouldn't do it. I think that's an extraordinary way 2 to proceed, and more importantly, it was easy to get 3 I mean, this, as the utility industry on board. 4 opposed to, you know, step on that. I frankly believe 5 that that was the case because we had long-standing 6 relationships there. And to be quite frank, I also 7 believe that was the case because the states have a 8 little regulatory authority going. 9 But the other significant thing was to see 10 other industries sign on. The automotive industry, 11 Service's Parcel United sort of UPS, 12 transportation sector, and one-by-one other industries 13 Pulp and paper, another large energy signing on. 14 Steel and aluminum, and even coal now are 15 putting forward their own plan. That, in my view, is 16 the way we need to proceed in the longer term. 17 Is that good enough? 18 Yes. SPEAKER: 19 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Okay. Thank you. 20 Anybody else? Any questions here, please? 21 I don't believe you guys are so quiet. Comments? 22 Yes? 23 have Madame Secretary, Ι SPEAKER: 24

> SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

produced -- in California. This is a very nice report

(202) 797-2525

with a lot of work -- what is your opinion of the success of having any of these things put into place so that we can continue -- sustainable developments you talk about? And what is the next step that you will take with this report in getting it implemented?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: I'm so glad you asked me that question because I was prepared to speak on it.

I think that we owe this Council support of, and communication of, and publication of the results of these studies. It would be very valuable to take into our Councils within the National Economic Council and our Administration in our dealings with the Treasury Department and the Congress. But too often what we do is file the report. We all know about it, and then we fail to take the next step which is to publicize it and use it as a tool of advocacy. That's the commitment I've made to you and that's the way we'll use it. You'll see not just me doing it, but Patricia and William and all the people in the Department of Energy who carry this mandate.

The other thing you should know is we're about to begin our public dialogue on a national energy strategy. Most of you know that the Congress requires that every two years, we do a National Energy

This will provide another platform as we go 1 Plan. throughout the country, engaging people in dialogue 2 and proposing what we believe ought to be some 3 Administration and national policy, federal policy, on 4 sustainable energy development, generally. We're 5 going to try out that theme. 6 In two locations, we will be holding 7 meetings that particularly focus on energy resources. 8 One is in Austin, Texas, and I don't think we've 9 settled yet the date for that. 10 And the next one, Reggie? We're doing two 11 Okay, he knows. It's the 12th. 12 of them. And then we're doing another one also in 13 Louisiana. And I want to tell you it's Shreveport and 14 I'm not clear on that date. 15 Anybody here clear on the Louisiana date? 16 It's New Orleans? Do you know the date? 17 So, that will be another opportunity to 18 platform this information and I'm glad that I have the 19 opportunity to ask you all to consider 20 now participation because what we need is strong voices 21 speaking out, so that we will be in concert, one with 22 another. 23 Yes, sir? 24

> SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

SPEAKER: Are you optimistic that most of

this or all of it will be adopted, put into effect? 1 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Are we being 2 covered by the press? Likely. 3 more optimism this season, T have 4 especially after the work done by Bob Ruben's folks in 5 the National Economic Council and at the formation of 6 this oil and gas caucus on the Hill. I think it will 7 be tough. All of this is very tough. Anything we're 8 lifting in the Congress is tough. 9 do that we can The things 10 administratively? You've read about Carol Browner's 11 no-nonsense policy, really taking a look at the 12 Yorktown and getting away from the cookie cutter 13 regulation of industries, generally is another step 14 forward. So, I am more optimistic this year than I 15 was 13 months ago. I think if we can leave this room 16 convinced that we really are partners in this effort--17 SPEAKER: If it's tough, maybe you'll get 18 tough with it. 19 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Well, I'd like to 20 think that everybody knows I'm tough. But if you 21 think I am required to get tougher, I know how to do 22 Thank you. that, too. 23 We're serious about this. We understand 24

-- I want to talk for a minute about this. We just

came back from India where our assignment given to us sustainable on by the President was to focus development in India. And at my age, I had really forgotten about the expansion that came to the United States because of this industry. But there in India in a village called Benares where there is no power and people's lives are so stunted by the fact that there's nothing to relieve this human production for Suddenly, you become aware of this fantastic work. Everybody wants what we've got. And so, I'm clear that we need to protect it in the United States. it and I'm I¹m on yes, optimistic.

so, yes, I'm on it and I'm very optimistic. But I want you all to understand that it's not Bill. It's me alone. it's not the President alone. It's not the Congress standing alone. It's all of us. That's my plea today for this partnership.

Yes, sir?

SPEAKER: Madame Secretary, I think your use of graphics is very effective and I was wondering if we, or the Departments, could have a kind of graphic summary of this marginal role report to support some of those thoughts and efforts.

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Yes, we'll take that on, but we'll use some help and make it a partnership as well. I like the Executive Summary but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

we need to -- yes, I call it grandmother language. How do I articulate it so my grandmother understands it? Or maybe about once every other month, I'll talk to a group of high school students and if we're communicating to them, then I know we're communicating well. So yes, we'll take on that assignment. Thank you.

Anybody else? Yes?

SPEAKER: Madame Secretary, kind of a follow-on to Bill Fisher's question but maybe you can talk just a minute or two about how you're trying to restructure the Department's R&D budget. And of course, secondly and more importantly, how do you think it will prevail on the Hill, particularly given the Bobby Byrd types and some other people?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Well -- god, I know I'm going to get quoted and I'll be in trouble again, in case you wonder how tough I am.

We have worked very hard to try and drive our budget through the strategy, and thanks for teeing that up for me. Because it has been our way to try to rationally approach the public and the Congress about what our needs are in terms of resource and more importantly, how they're being spent.

It's a tough piece because -- I want to

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

say this well and I probably won't. The business of the Department of Energy, unlike most agencies, crosssubcommittees, 22, 23 want say Ι to authorization and appropriation. So, everybody is in And because it's so unfocused, our business. represented by those mandates and the fact that the Department was built from so many different agencies -- I am in trouble -- everybody thinks a piece of that budget belongs to them. And there are entitlements there that are as old as maybe I am. And it's a very tough piece to take the walk to a new vision when the budget often reflects needs at home. And I am in You mentioned the chairman, I didn't. trouble. don't want to mention that chairman, but I could mention any others.

I'll give you examples. I end up with a wing in a hospital and it's like "Dear Lord, I don't thank you for these gifts I'm about to receive." because someone on that committee has a hospital at home that needs something and suddenly, I've got a wing. When I first came to the job, I learned to ask my people, "is this a real project or is this pork?" And they would go "oink, oink" on the pork things. Well, that's as old as politics. But with budgets so tight, we can not afford the porkers that don't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

support the mission. And I would have other examples, but you get the picture. That means it's more important that we have a coalition of people supporting the initiatives.

Now, I want to leave a thought with you. On our energy efficiency budget this year, much of which will reflect the needs of this industry as we work on more efficient production, we must have had over 1,000 -- maybe 2,000, 3,000 letters coming into the Department. Therefore, going to the Hill in support of that budget. That doesn't happen with this industry. So, it's very hard to walk the piece up when you're looking around behind you and you don't have that broad a constituency. So that's why I keep saying, we need to work on the strategic that pulls the public along with us.

Is that enough? Okay.

speaker: You know, looking at the graph, the problem is right there. Until you move energy resources squarely in the middle, Washington will never understand it. The city is going to use more energy today for the air conditioning bill than the entire nation of Bangladesh will use. We are totally -- those other -- couldn't exist without it.

I don't think anyone is concerned as to

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

how that energy pool is made up. Our needs are high enough. We're going to use it all. Renewable energy, fine if somebody can figure it out. But until that energy resource thing in the center of that, the Department and its inter-relationship with the entire government is not going to be understood. I know the science and technology group, they're admirable but hey, they couldn't exist without the Energy.

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: And let me tell you this with respect. There's a whole constituency who says, "you've just got to put us in the center." Here, here, and certainly, here today. With respect, I think we need to drive the messages from each of these pieces --

unless you put it in the center and the rest hang on it. Now, I can see politically, environmental quality put right square in the middle but it just isn't going to work that way. Try turning the air conditioning off in this town. It would be a very good example of our energy dependency and give me ten minutes' notice so I can leave.

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Get out of here.

Does anybody else have ideas about whether the circle needs to be redone? Or would you like to

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

move on to another area?

message.

SPEAKER: Do you want to take a vote?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: And then I'll go
next week to the National Security Advisory Committee
and see what they have to say. I think I get the

Yes, ma'am?

SPEAKER: I guess I don't understand why sustainable development, which is really a concept that takes all the pieces including research and technology, why that isn't in the center? Because that is the life blood of the United States. It is the fact that we've been able to progress. We're exploring all kinds of different technologies — quality outward, but as far as the recognition of sustainable development versus — control, you know, I'm just totally committed.

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Good. Thank you.

We've had others suggest that the center needs to be changed. I had a very bright and seasoned person say, "call this knowledge and empowerment because then it will drive everything." I get you, sir.

Anyone else?

SPEAKER: Madame Secretary?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Yes, sir.

about the rate of consumption of energy in relation to the rate of increased production, giving kind of a new slant to our industry in the pretty near future. From your perspective -- and there has been some articles on this, that maybe we may not be too far away to where price is probably going to be the controlling factor of use of energy.

Have you got any insight on that?

CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: If you're asking me will demand sort of begin to outstrip supply, and therefore, heat up price?

SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am.

this work that we've been doing in Russia, in India, about to do in China, really relates to that piece because unless we can figure out how -- it's not only the energy source, it's the capital source.

As an example, Asia sucks up a trillion dollars in the next ten years chasing after their energy development, then that's going to heat up the capital market more than most of us can stand. That will also heat up the price of energy which will be a good piece as well.

you're talking about supplies, But 1 specifically? 2 I'm saying the demand will SPEAKER: 3 outweigh the ability to supply. Then in that case, 4 the price will be the controlling factor. 5 And with that in mind, as we study this 6 report, then we're talking about six or seven trillion 7 dollars' worth of well in these marginal wells, in 8 these reserves, in these old reservoirs. Does that 9 have any more significance to what we're doing here 10 today? 11 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Well, I certainly 12 think it's the most urgent piece for us in the United 13 States and ought to be advanced, which is why it has 14 been. But we've got to look back and get the rest of 15 the work done as well. And I understand your point. 16 Yes, it is the most critical piece we can advance this 17 year, in my mind. 18 Anyone else? 19 Yes, sir? 20 SPEAKER: Madame Secretary, I think that 21 there's some doubt and there's some concern among the 22 And at the same time, I think this industry. 23 Administration is urging us to change and is saying 24 things will change, nothing stays forever. 25

that's wise on your part. We may not agree with you 1 on all the specifics and I'm sure there are individual 2 But I think it's very clear that different opinions. 3 things are changing and that we need to have some 4 self-examination and examine our business strategies 5 and be susceptible to change. 6 I see these reports of overwhelming 7 demand, and yet I've seen them my entire career. 8 responded, technology has and Science 9 innovationists of the American entrepreneur. I think 10 focusing on the change and giving us a forum in which 11 to discuss the change and how we can adapt to it and 12 keep competitiveness is extremely important. You all 13 are doing that better than any Administration I've 14 I appreciate that. ever tried to work with. 15 Thank you. CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: 16 Anybody on the other side want to be heard 17 Anyone else? It's been very quiet over here. 18 Then I guess we're finished. Thank you 19 Thank you. very much. 20 (Applause.) 21 Thank you very much, CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 22 Madame Secretary. 23 administrative several have now We 24 The first is, I will present a short report

on some meetings of the Co-chairs' Coordinating Committee.

For those of you who are new to the Council, this was an administrative committee that was established in 1992 to monitor the progress and enhance the effectiveness of NPC activities. The Committee has met twice since the last meeting of the full Council, the first meeting occurring on December 9, 1993, and then the Committee met again yesterday afternoon.

At the December meeting, we presented to Secretary O'Leary, the interim report of the Oil Pollution Act Study which had been approved by the Council, by ballot, earlier that day. We also discussed with the Secretary, the sections of the Domestic Natural Gas and Oil Initiative concerning the marginal well study and the study of government industry roles.

At our meeting yesterday, we summarized the draft findings of the studies dealing with the Oil Pollution Act and marginal wells, both of which you have subsequently approved today, and we discussed the possibility of two new studies. You will hear more about one of these studies when Frank McPherson presents the report of the Agenda Committee next. The

Secretary alluded to the other study which some are calling a larger study, which is not yet been officially requested. She alluded to those in her comments.

This report -- my report on the Co-chairs'
Coordinating Committee does not require a vote of the
Council membership, but I'd be happy to answer any
questions or hear any comments, should there be any.

Okay, hearing none, let's move then to the report of the Agenda Committee. I'd like to ask Frank McPherson, chairman of the Agenda Committee to come forward at this time.

Frank?

MR. McPHERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary O'Leary has requested the

Council's advice on our nation's research and

development needs as they relate to both the upstream

and downstream of oil and gas operations. A copy of

the Secretary's letter to Ray Hunt is in your packet

before you at your places. As required by the

Council's Articles of Organization, this request was

referred to your Agenda Committee.

The Committee believes that this is a particularly timely request as both the industry and government strive to reduce cost while maintaining a

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

viable oil and gas sector in the U.S. economy. The 1 Committee supports the concept of government-industry 2 research, partnerships, where such arrangements can 3 effectively expand our basic knowledge of oil and gas 4 environmental protection, and reservoirs, 5 conversion. We do acknowledge the difficulties the 6 Council will face in determining the level and 7 character of ongoing research and in providing a 8 consensus view of future priorities. 9 I am pleased to report that it is the 10 unanimous recommendation of the Agenda Committee that 11 this request is proper and advisable, and that a 12 committee should be formed expeditiously to prepare a 13 report for the full Council's consideration. 14 Mr. Chairman, this concludes the report of 15 the Agenda Committee. On their behalf, I move that it 16 be adopted by the Council. 17 Thank you, Frank. CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 18 The report has been moved. 19 Is there a second? 20 Motion is seconded. Any discussion? 21 All in favor signify by saying aye? 22 Opposed? 23 Motion carries. 24 Thank you, Frank, and thanks to all the 25

people on your Committee.

Next is the report of the Finance Committee. I'd like to ask John Hall, the Chairman of that committee to come forward at this time.

John?

MR. HALL: Thank you very much, Ray.

And thank you, Madame Secretary, for being here for the first time ever for the Secretary to hear the Finance Committee report.

The Finance Committee met this morning to review the financial status of the Council. We met with representatives of Ernst and Young, our independent outside auditors. Based on their audit, I'm pleased to report to you that our accounting procedures and controls received high marks and our financial condition is strong.

We also reviewed our receipts and expenditures for the first half of calendar year 1994, and projections for the last half of the year. As a result of this review, we're well within our projected expenditures and we do not need to change our approximate \$2.8 million budget that you approved last year. Our receipts are running a little ahead of our projections and we'll meet our goal of restoring our contingency fund to a six month operating level. We

will not be, at this meeting, asking for any additional contributions from the members. We'll stay at the same level.

We also discussed a suggested contribution for the 50 new members that have not had the opportunity to contribute. Since we do not have data for most of you, we will be sending you a work sheet which will allow you to figure your suggested contribution for 1994. Since you were only appointed in April and are just now beginning to participate, we recommend that you contribute only one-half of the normal suggested amount for 1994.

Finally, as I mentioned in my last report, the data on which individual members' suggested contributions are calculated is based on 1987 to 1988 sales and production numbers. We all recognize the many changes in our industry over the last several years, and the Committee recommends collecting 1992-1993 data to be used for calculating your '95 suggested contributions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes my report and I move it be adopted by the Council.

CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Thank you, John.

A motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion?

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

1	All in favor, signify by saying aye?
2	Opposed?
3	Motion carries.
4	I need to also point out that in spite of
5	the fact that the finances of the NPC are quite
6	healthy, there is no truth to the rumor that we are
7	about to go public.
8	Next, we have the report of the Nominating
9	Committee, Collis Chandler.
10	Collis?
11	MR. CHANDLER: Thank you, Ray.
12	The National Petroleum Council's
13	Nominating Committee met yesterday to agree on its
14	recommendations for NPC officers and chairmen and
15	members of the Agenda, the Appointment Committee, as
16	well as the five at-large members of the NPC Cochairs'
17	Coordinating Committee.
18	On behalf of the Committee, I am pleased
19	to offer the following nominations:
20	For NPC Chairman, Larry Fuller. For NPC
21	Vice Chairman, Dennis Hendrix.
22	For the Agenda Committee, we recommend the
23	
24	11
25	myself, Ken Derr, Dick Farman, Frank McPherson, John

SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W.

1	Miller, Jack Murphy, and Lee Thomas, with Joe Foster
2	serving as Chairman.
3	For the Appointment Committee, we
4	recommend the following as members:
5	Bob Campbell, John Croom, Tom Cruikshank,
6	Al DeCrane, David Dorn, A.V. Jones, Dino Nicandros,
7	Bobby Parker, Lee Raymond, and Irene Wischer, with
8	Leighton Steward serving as Chairman.
9	In addition, we recommend the following as
10	the "at-large" members of the Cochairs' Coordinating
11	Committee:
12	Truman Arnold, David Biegler, Fred
13	Hamilton, Frank Heintz, and Bobby Parker.
14	Mr. Chairman, this completes the report of
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	The report of the Nominating Committee has
2	been moved.
2	Is there a second? Second.
2	
2	All in favor, signify by saying aye?
2	Opposed?
2	Motion carries.

1

2

3

4 .

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now that I have been fired, I would like to make just a couple of very, very brief comments.

a very it has been First, privilege and honor to have served in this capacity for the last couple of years. A great many of you in this room have worked on committees or in different capacities as we have continued to modify the NPC to existing circumstances the adjust environment in which we all live, and in which the I feel that the NPC has government operates. continued to remain a very effective tool for the Department of Energy to utilize.

I want to comment about the staff of the NPC. Each of us in this room has had the opportunity to deal with not-for-profit organizations, whether it's a school, a church, a hospital, a chamber of commerce, some public interest group, whatever it is. And we've all been exposed to different staffs. I have never been exposed to a staff that is any better than the staff we have at the NPC.

Marshall Nicholls has been with the NPC for 23 years. Several other members of the staff have similar tenures. They do an outstanding job. And as the Secretary alluded, this is one of the very few advisory organizations where the members pay the

expense of the organization. Folks, we really get our money's worth with respect to the staff, whose salaries we pay.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Secondly, there is one person I want to really thank for a lot of counsel and guidance that he provided me during the last couple of years, and that's Collis Chandler. Collis was chairman of the NPC from 1976 to 1978. That was the time period when the DOE was created and the NPC moved from the Department of Interior to the Department of Energy. His counsel and sage advice has been invaluable over these last several years.

Thank you very much, Collis.

with that, now we'll move to the last item on the agenda, and that is, regretfully, a memorial tribute to Dave True who had been a member of the National Petroleum Council for over 30 years. I would like to ask Bob Anderson to come forward and present a memorial resolution in Dave's honor.

Bob?

MR. ANDERSON: I have here a Memorial Resolution to H.A. True, Jr., dated July 27, 1994.

The members of the National Petroleum Council were deeply saddened by the death of their

distinguished colleague, H.A. "Dave" True, Jr., on June 4, 1994.

Dave was born in Cheyenne, Wyoming, and graduated from Montana State College. He worked as a roustabout pumper, and as a foreman and superintendent of drilling and production in Wyoming for The Texas Company. Dave later joined Reserve Drilling Company, Inc., eventually serving as its President.

A born entrepreneur, Dave diversified his holdings into trucking, agriculture and banking. In addition to serving as partner in the True Oil Company and True Drilling Company, the Eighty-Eight Oil Company, the True Geothermal Energy Company, True Ranches, and Belle Fourche Pipeline Company. He was also Vice President of the White Stallion Ranch, Inc., a director of Midland Financial Corporation, and president of the Toolpushers Supply Company, as well as Black Hills Trucking.

Dave True was a well respected spokesman for the oil industry. As a member of the National Petroleum Council, his advice was sought by successive Secretaries of the Interior and Energy for over 30 years. He was elected NPC Chairman in the early 1970s and served on more than 20 study committees. Dave served as president of the Independent Petroleum

Association of America, as a director of the American 1 Petroleum Institute. In addition, Dave was an active 2 member of many other national and regional industry 3 organizations. 4 Therefore, with sincere admiration for his 5 achievements and contributions to the industry and the 6 Council, and with a sense of great loss, be it 7 resolved on this 27th day of July 1994, that the 8 deepest sympathy of the members of the National 9 Petroleum Council be extended to Dave True's widow, 10 Jean, as well as his family. 11 this that resolved further Τt is 12 resolution be entered upon the permanent records of 13 the Council, and that an appropriate copy thereof be 14 delivered to his family as a remembrance of the 15 Council's esteem and deep appreciation. 16 We have lost a friend. 17 Mr. Chairman, may we have a moment of 18 silence? 19 Thank you. 20 Thank you very much, CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 21 Bob. 22 I will presume that that motion has been 23 approved. 24 We now have the last item on the agenda, 25

and that is the discussion of any other matters that 1 may come before this meeting. I'd like to throw the 2 floor open to any members of the NPC. 3 Madame Secretary? 4 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: I'd like to close 5 a loop if it makes sense. There's been lots of 6 discussion about the big study. I'm not certain that 7 we're clear about what the elements of the big study 8 should be. There are lots of ideas abounding. 9 With your permission, I would like to 10 suggest that we put staff of the Department as well as 11 staff of the Council together to try and outline a 12 scope of work, and then float a draft to all of the 13 members so that we might take appropriate next steps. 14 Does that make sense? 15 CHAIRPERSON HUNT: Yes. 16 CO-CHAIRPERSON O'LEARY: Fine, thank you. 17 Thank you, Madame CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 18 Secretary. 19 Any other comments or questions? 20 Bill? 21 just DEPUTY SECRETARY WHITE: Ι Ray, 22 thought I'd make one comment on behalf 23 Secretary, and particularly, to the new members. 24 This group performs a critical function in 25

what we're trying to accomplish on some specific things in energy policy. Trade associations and lawyers and the like perform a very useful role in this town. But I'll tell you what, to have an authoritative group that can provide factual information concerning some of these critical issues, such as OPA '90, marginal wells, gas supply, the cost or refinery regulation, pulling no punches, is critical when we try to influence policy on each of those issues.

I know that you're coming here, the new financial There's voluntarily. members, contribution. But I don't think that we could do as good a job unless we had the information provided by If you look at the the studies in this group. specific things we're doing with each of these studies, they are not just sitting on the shelf. That's true with OPA '90, and it is true with the marginal well study. The preliminary results of that study were communicated to the President, which is one reason he made the statement that he did about marginal wells to the group of Senators six weeks ago. And why he instructed us in the Administration to come up with a plan on marginal wells that did not exacerbate the deficit.

> SAG, CORP 4218 LENORE LANE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

1 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, I just wanted to say for the newcomers to this meeting, how valuable their participation and 1 input to the Secretary and I was, Ray. 2 3 Thanks. Thank you very much, 4 CHAIRPERSON HUNT: 5 Bill. Are there any other comments? 6 Okay, before we adjourn, I would like to 7 remind the members of the media that there will be a 8 press conference which will start up in about ten 9 minutes after we adjourn here. Could you please move 10 to the front? The people who have been involved in 11 the two studies that have been approved will be 12 available for questions at that time. 13 Again, it has been a real pleasure for me 14 to serve in this capacity. The NPC is truly blessed 15 to have Larry Fuller as its new Chairman. 16 will be kept very, very busy the next two years, I 17 18 the meeting is adjourned. know. 19 With that, 20 Thank you. (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 21 22 10:00 a.m.) 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of Meeting,

Before National Petroleum Council,

Held on July 27, 1994,

J 4 9 2 2'.

In the location of Washington, DC,

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.